

Reiter Foothills Recreation Planning Committee
Meeting # 12
May 20, 2009 6 to 8:45 p.m.

Meeting Purpose: To review and discuss mapped recreation concepts, issues, and strategies. To review and discuss recreation management objectives, strategies and priorities. To review the timeline and next steps for DNR plan development and implementation

Welcome:

- Review agenda
- General housekeeping items

DNR Update:

Trioba Adventure Race – The race is scheduled for May 30th and consists of whitewater rafting, trekking, and mountain biking. Trekking and mountain biking will be taking place in the southeast portion of the planning area.

Deer Flats PC – The timber sale is active and located on the Deer Flats Mainline road. If you're in the area, be cautious of log trucks and other equipment.

City of Sultan – DNR received a letter from the City of Sultan requesting more access for motorized use and automobile traffic on the planning concept maps. Committee will be emailed copies of that letter.

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) – Contact has been made and they will be involved as we start looking specifically at right of way access during plan implementation.

Interim Work – DNR has begun some on-site interim work in the Reiter Foothills. It has been going well with a lot of positive input from visitors. DNR has been sending out weekly updates regarding current work and the number of citations issued.

DNR Budget – Next biennium money includes about \$139,000 for recreational purposes at Reiter Foothills, which includes funding for staff, on-site presence, grant funded resources, and signage for recreational areas. We will continue to look for other funding sources.

Questions and Comments:

- *Is there a preliminary trail map that DNR is using along with the interim work?*
DNR Response: No, the DNR has many of the routes inventoried, but those maps are for planning purposes at this time.
- *Have there been any tickets written for WACs with regards to resource damage?*
DNR Response: No, most of the tickets have been violations of RCW's regarding ORV use (RCW 46.09). We have been posting signs which make it a more viable option to cite people when they are somewhere that they shouldn't be.
- *How is the loss of NOVA grant funds going to effect the Reiter Foothills implementation?*

DNR Response: Met with the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) and we are trying to extend the grants that we currently have. DNR has received some Employment Securities money for a WCC crew. Also met with statewide leadership and identified creative ways to fill the gap in the short term.

Present and Discuss Final Mapped Recreation Concepts

See attached Mapped Recreation Concepts.

The DNR collected and reviewed the responses from the last meeting regarding the concepts. All committee members who were absent last month were contacted to get their input regarding the concepts. The DNR did some additional field visits to verify certain areas with regards to the concepts.

The two concept maps were presented to the committee, highlighting the difference between the two concepts. By further examining the differences between the two approaches, the committee's input will provide valuable input when the concepts are brought to the DNR decision makers. We want to inform them on the issues surrounding the two concepts.

Main elements that are the same on both concept maps:

- Non-motorized area around Wallace Falls State Park
- Camping for motorized area
- Fishing access feasibility is now on both concepts. The adjacency of the railroad and the highway are a little bit of a concern along Route 2 east of Index. We will look for options in the entire planning area along the Skykomish River.
- May Creek and Wallace River are both shown as non-motorized based on the history of use the area and desire from a management perspective to provide separate trail systems.

Main differences between the two concept maps:

- Concept D is the same as the version presented in April, with the area from Reiter road to the Wallace River shown as non-motorized.
- Concept E has been revised and identifies the area from Reiter road to Wallace River as an area slated for future development when the resource damage is corrected and the access through the bottleneck in the planning area is resolved.

Questions and Comments:

- *On both concepts, the motorized area extends further into the aquifer recharge area under the powerlines, is this a change from past concepts?*

DNR Response: The idea was not to add more mileage in the aquifer recharge area, but to use the powerline as a potential solution for a connection.

Committee Member Response: There is room between the recharge area and the pond to have a trail connection.

- *It appears as if we are taking the most heavily used area and turning it to a no use area?*

DNR Response: DNR is not going to develop any formal facilities in that area in the near future until we can determine access and noise issues. In Concept E it indicates potential for future development once these issues can be addressed.

- *Would it be fair to say the area is on hold?*
DNR Response: Yes, the priority and funds available to successfully manage motorized recreation in the area would be focused in the area identified for motorized in the southeast portion of the planning area.
- *Can you point to any other 1100 acre or smaller motorized recreation area in the country that has been successful?*
DNR Response: Riverside in Spokane is only about 600 acres.
- *Riverside is not as heavily used as Reiter and is wide open for riding. It is not a forest with trails.*
DNR Response: We cannot handle the capacity of use that is currently at Reiter.
- *Motorized representatives have said that we don't want to be precluded from that section. This will shut off access to Gold Bar Nature Trails, provide no designated parking area, put motorized use into an area that doesn't have trails and an aquifer recharge area that we need to protect. This will shut us out of the area to the north that could sustain motorized use.*
- *From the motorized community, Reiter is a motorized recreation area. This will not be viewed as new development; it is a loss of motorized opportunity.*
- *Intent is that motorized and non motorized can work together to get enough funding to manage and maintain this area. It is not a developed area. It has been developed by users at the expense of non-motorized users. There needs to be a whole lot of money to get this area up to standard. The outlaw mentality that has gone on out there has caused concern for some members of the public. There needs to be a place where we can demonstrate effective management to change that perception, and then we can go out and develop other areas for motorized use. If the shaded area in concept E is developed for motorized, there will be no trailhead for non-motorized. We can't have the non-motorized trailhead together with motorized use, it will discourage non-motorized users, who can be valuable allies to secure funding for development. There needs to be a non-motorized trailhead in that area so people can see the change towards responsible motorized recreation in the area.*
- *The scale of this planning approach is too limited. We need to look at Reiter as a whole Sky Valley Recreation concept. You can go anywhere to hike, but nowhere to ride motorized vehicles. Concerns could be placated if you shaded some future motorized area. Once these lines are drawn without that designation, they will never get changed.*
- *Disagree with DNR's suggestion that there was agreement regarding the non-motorized area in the north. There was no agreement.*
- *Motorized and non-motorized need to work together, but Riverside is a bad example because it is a big open sandy area to ride. Walker Valley's model is to have 7 miles for 1000 acres. 1100 acres same ratio would be 10 miles. There is too much demand at Reiter to pull this amount of shaded motorized area. Concept E could have potential for more future motorized areas. There is a lot of potential for more hiking trails in the wilderness or Wallace Falls State Park, Reiter is the only opportunity for motorized use in the future in this area, while hiking potential is everywhere.*
- *Most of the other hiking trails are not accessible most of year due to snow. Wilderness areas are not really for recreation. There are resource guidelines for wilderness land that preclude promotion of high use (12 heart-beat rule). Topography in Wild Sky is too difficult to develop hiking trails. Most of it is unsuitable.*

- *The Wild Sky Wilderness gained public support by saying it was to expand recreation opportunities and now we are here saying it isn't for recreation.*
Facilitator Response: We aren't here to resolve issues related to wilderness designation and recreational use guidelines. We do need to use this meeting's time to discuss these mapped concepts with regards to the planning area.
- *The key to success is motorized and non motorized users working together. What happened to the NOVA grant fund is unfortunate. If DNR doesn't have money to maintain what we have, how can we keep asking for more? You must have a non-motorized trailhead if there are hiking trails. It is just like a campground is needed for motorized use. What are some options to get money to deal with what we already have?*
- *Separate trailheads are critical. Funds are limited, but we could draw the lines so there is an area reserved for future development when monies are available.*
- *For the two trailheads it seems the division is at a convenient place based on property constraints. Worry is safety concern about amount of motorized users recreating in such a small area. We must take current use and the areas people are used to going into consideration.*
- *Having a hard time, because there is a lot of passion involved and an existing use already there. These historic conditions are even worse when areas for motorized use is so limited in the Region, and at the same time the science of resource damage recreation use causes cannot be ignored. This is too small of an area to provide for all uses. There is a greater need to provide motorized use in the area, which makes me want to re-evaluate if either D or E is a good concept.*
- *Snohomish County Parks has the same sort of divisions between types of users of many kinds. Can have sympathy for DNR because this is a difficult area to be planning. Also because there isn't really any other place for motorized recreation. Frankly, don't know how to resolve the issue but it is often impossible to resolve the issues in any park. Don't have a solution. Can't favor motorized over the others. If this area is too small they will go somewhere else where they aren't wanted and spread resource damage into new areas*
- *This is a dilemma. It is unfortunate, but I think of Reiter as a sacrificial area. It is heavily impacted. Have a real serious concern that the ORV community is going to go somewhere else. Reiter has historically been used and heavily impacted. Use could be managed. Have seen all the areas get closed to motorized use, and this may be an opportunity to manage that use on a landscape that has already been impacted. There is opportunity for other users too, but not sure in reality how well that works with mixed use. You can't satisfy everybody's desires for using the planning area. The brown polygon (area slated for future development) concerns me because that area is the base of what is used now, and that current use will be difficult for DNR to stop. That area should be used for motorized use because there are other areas that are more sensitive. It's a real dilemma, resource impacts need to be addressed, but motorized users need the additional area due to high concentration of users in the region.*
- *If there are other DNR lands in the vicinity, then those areas could be used to provide more suitable natural breaks between motorized and non-motorized uses. It would make sense to put non-motorized in a location where the land and other uses are more compatible.*

DNR Responses: The DNR has many policies, a Habitat Conservation Plan, and other regulations. We need to get the facilities and trails up to standard before we develop more. DNR doesn't have the capability to manage and maintain additional trail and facilities. Operating recreation trails and facilities is not an inexpensive endeavor. Now we will have a plan and some resources to put into play.

- *Concerned that the DNR will continue to choose to create areas that are too small to accommodate the current level of use.*

DNR Response: The other planning areas in the state are much larger (Western Yacolt Burn Forest is 40,000 acres and Ahtanum State Forest is 70,000 acres).

- *What types of activities would be in the brown area for the future?*

DNR Response: In that area, we need to address sediment issues. We will probably focus efforts in the yellow area in the short term. The users are going to need to help manage that. We need to define what types of recreation are appropriate. The other issues that we need to address are sound (or noise), access, and private land.

- *Not clear of timeframe of brown area? Organized motorized users know there is a problem and have been working hard to educate users. To close the area in brown and up to the Wallace area is an issue, it's too confining. The population base for Reiter is much higher than all your other planning areas. To shrink it down to these levels is short sighted. The potential needs to be there. There are so many non-motorized access areas, there needs to be an acceptable amount of land available for motorized use or else they will illegally ride somewhere else.*

- *What do the suitability maps for the area between May Creek and Wallace River say?*

DNR Response: There were noise issues in that area.

- *Suitability maps aren't based on field data.*

Committee Response: The suitability maps didn't preclude motorized use between Wallace and May Creek.

- *Suitability is extremely important. The other things that are important are to be in compliance with the WACs and DNR's Policy for Sustainable Forests. In some cases, Reiter is not in compliance with those policies. If we can establish an area that we can showcase, than there will be opportunity for other areas in the future.*
- *A place the size of Reiter would be like closing Lake Washington to motorized boat use and every boat then went to Lake Sammamish.*
- *Partnership between motorized and non-motorized is good, but how does that look here? What is the timeframe for that? Are the trail builders going to be too old to use the trails?*
- *DNR needs to partner with Wallace Falls State Park and make the whole western section non-motorized as well as area north of park. Then motorized use between May Creek and Wallace River should continue.*
- *Mapped based concept should be motorized use from Wallace Falls State Park to the Index Wall. If we need to have non-motorized use in corridors of that area, then the motorized users might be able to support it as a recommendation.*
- *Access issue is easy - easement or land transaction.*
- *The future use area should be specifically for motorized use.*

- *Area between Reiter Road and Wallace River is very suitable and the southeast part is not because of the gooseneck, poor access, the aquifer recharge area and other issues.*
- *Is the restriction for use in the aquifer recharge area science based? Of course all of us care about our drinking water, but what is the real threat of having ORV trails within that area?*
- *What is more dangerous about motorized recreation versus the regular forest practices that occur in the area?*
- *What makes Reiter unique, and maybe also problematic, is it's an area that has seen motorized and non-motorized use for a long time and that creates the opportunity to provide both use types. The resource damage and destroyed habitat needs to be addressed. There needs to be separation between motorized and non-motorized uses. If this was an area that never had non-motorized use historically, it wouldn't have that potential. If someone posed a lawsuit against the state, than what happens? The yellow area needs to be phased in successfully and then that provides further opportunity for motorized use elsewhere.*
- *The future use area must be agreed upon and documented for a certain period of time or until established benchmarks are met.*
- *If the area all the up towards Wallace Falls State Park is non-motorized, than it isn't a partnership.*
- *Need to use yellow area as a model, then expand motorized to Wallace River.*
- *There has never been a water quality issue documented in the town of Index. It is tested on a regular basis and future use in the area will have less an impact because it will be managed.*
- *In the timber sale called Deer Flats PC, is there documented damage from the use in that area historically?*
DNR Response: No, there are limited motorized routes in that area, therefore damage to the tree growth is not documented. The DNR must abide by Forest Practice standards, DOE water quality standards, requirements for sound, and the HCP.
- *What is the damage that is occurring?*
DNR Response: Examples include items such as sediment loading in streams, impact to vegetation in riparian areas, damage to trees and soil loss.
- *How many users do the Reiter trails have now?*
DNR Response: 40,000-50,000 users per year is DNR's estimate. There are generally about 300 users on a weekend day.
- *Why can't we put future motorized use in the aquifer area after DNR decides if they can legally do so?*
- *The resource damage is not debatable, and the DNR would be liable if someone were to file a lawsuit.*
- *Boundaries shouldn't be set in stone; DNR should review them over time based on looking at site specific areas.*
- *Doesn't the county delineate the aquifer boundaries?*
DNR Response: Yes they are required to do that based on the "best available science".
- *But the county has no prohibitions against recreational trails in that area.*
- *Motorized use can't be put into such a confined area for this short term. It is going to destroy other landscapes. More area needs to be identified as future motorized trail development.*

- *The area between Wallace River and May Creek has a noise issue. Topography influences noise and non-motorized users don't want to put up with noise.*

Present and Discuss Recreation Management Objectives, Strategies, and Priorities

See attached document outlining the Committee's recommendations on management objectives, strategies, and priorities. These will be included in the plan that will be written by the DNR. If more time is needed to review this, you can email any comments.

In addition to the objectives and strategies are the capital project priorities as well as the easement and acquisition strategies.

The following are the priorities for capital projects:

1. Motorized trail and trailhead
2. Non-motorized trail and trailhead
3. Campground for motorized use
4. Feasibility of fishing access on the Skykomish River

For the acquisition and easement priorities:

1. Pursue a connection between the southeast and central portion of the planning area
2. Pursue adding to the planning area by acquiring adjacent parcels
3. Pursue improved public access on the portion of the planning area west of Wallace Falls State Park

DNR – Is there anything missing?

- *Concept E doesn't have trailhead for non-motorized, yet it is a priority?*
- *Should be more specific regarding restoration of damaged areas, calling it out as a stand-alone objective.*
- *Can we find a way to engage youth in maintenance and restoration?*
DNR Response: The objective and strategies document includes strategies related to youth involvement and education.
- *Nothing specific about trail maps for safety and management is included, it needs to be added.*
- *A grid outline on maps would be helpful for emergency responders.*
- *What happened to idea of usage fees?*
DNR Response: See the objective to "identify alternate funding strategies" in the objective and strategies document.
- *Would like to see a feasibility study for a NRCA in the area for the future. An area managed for conservation.*
- *Does that take the land away from being a working forest?*
Committee Response: When areas are designated as NRCA's, the legislature gives DNR money to acquire more trust land to manage, such as the Manke property, which could make the motorized area larger.

- *Fund raising should be a strategy. Legislature must give DNR options to raise funds for recreation. DNR isn't a recreation agency like State Parks. They aren't going to see the funds needed to carry out the things that the recreationists want.*
- *Bipartisanship is the easiest way to get things through the legislature. In Loomis forest, we raised funds to pay the timber price and environmental community benefitted by not logging it. We could do same thing here. Long termed goal, but it could work.*

Can everybody support those?

- *Devil is in details. The DNR tendency is to put all money in the trailheads. We already have trailheads in this area. It is a waste of money to redevelop a trailhead for 50k people per year. It doesn't pass the sanity test. Switch the order of trailhead and trail system in the wording of the development priorities.*
DNR Response: Need restrooms, need waste management, must be some facilities to contain the impact of the people out there.
- *Does basic mean paved to DNR?*
Committee Response: Walker isn't paved, Elbe isn't paved.
DNR Response: There are some basic amenities that we need to provide. Restrooms, Signs, Rules, etc. Anything built from now on, will most likely have to go through the permitting process with Snohomish County.
- *This is not a detailed plan, just a general document with high level guidance.*
- *At Walker Valley, grant money paid to get design firm to begin trail design and construction.*
DNR Response: Due to the budget situation, this will most likely be done internally.
- *What map based concept is going to be attached to this document? (see discussion below)*

Review Next Steps for DNR Plan Development and Implementation

The DNR will take all this feedback from the Committee's thus far and include what we heard tonight. We will take that to the DNR decision makers to help us develop the whole draft plan. After internal review, we will give Committee members copies of the draft plan, and then begin the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process.

We will probably do SEPA in August-September. There will most likely be a public meeting associated with that public review.

Following SEPA, the plan will go through executive review and then finalization.

Questions and Comments:

- *Concerned that we will be characterized as supporting a plan that the Committee did not even see. Representation of our endorsement is not clear.*
- DNR Response: Committee members will have an opportunity to view the plan prior to public release for SEPA. Any comments can be addressed through discussion with DNR staff or through the formal SEPA written comment period.
- *What do you mean when you say you will consider all of what you have heard tonight?*

DNR Response: Through review of the notes and other summaries

- *We do not endorse the limited size of motorized use.*
- *Should have a structured comment sheet for us to fill out so that the Committee's responses will be clearly available for decision makers.*
- *Can you agree that we ask DNR to consider making the area in aquifer and brown area larger in the future?*

Committee Member Response: I can't support proposed uses at aquifer recharge area.

- *As a concept, not that they are necessarily going to do it. They will evaluate it and base decision on sound science rather than what we as committee members feel.*

Committee Member Response: Don't think committee should go there. Don't think DNR should go there. For the brown area, there needs to be a non-motorized trailhead. Could have upper area in brown as a future motorized area with non-motorized down below. Can't support because it is the best mountain bike area in the brown.

- *Why is it we never had a single concept that the motorized users could support?*

DNR Response: We did have a concept with motorized in the May Creek-Wallace River area. As we progressed, based on suitability and comments, this is where we have arrived.

- *Add another box on matrix so the acreages add up.*
- *Now that we are done with our input, what is the timeframe between now and if and when this becomes a managed system? Will we be moving in the direction towards D or E now?*

DNR Response: These are the issues we are outlining right now working with our agency partners.

- *What is the funding for the new biennium at Reiter?*

DNR Response: Recreation manager position plus half of another position. Also, there is \$140,000 in addition to staff time to implement at Reiter.

- *Think we all agree presence on the ground is most critical.*
- *The location of the motorized camping/trailhead area, Reiter road isn't really able to handle that much traffic.*

THANK YOU!!! Not just the process you signed up for, but the one that it became. DNR will be much more prepared to handle these tough issues in the future because of the hard work and discussion that this committee has had.

DRAFT — For Discussion Purposes Only — DRAFT 5/18/09

Reiter Foothills Recreation Planning Committee

Draft Objectives and Strategies

Management Goals

The goals for managing recreation statewide including Reiter Foothills are:

- **Goal 1:** Ensure the safety of the public, department employees and volunteers
- **Goal 2:** Ensure recreation is consistent with trust obligations
- **Goal 3:** Ensure recreation is consistent with resource protection
- **Goal 4:** Provide quality recreation experiences that can be sustained over time

Recreation Management Objectives and Strategies

The following objectives need to be consistent with the goals of DNR's Recreation Program. Each includes detailed strategies that provide specific guidance on how to carry out the plan. All objectives and strategies depend on funding. For ease of reference, these objectives and their corresponding strategies are grouped into seven categories:

- Education and Enforcement
- Partnership and volunteer coordination
- Facility management
- Facility management
- Trail management
- Sustainable funding
- Development implementation priorities
- Easement and acquisition priorities

Education and Enforcement

Objective A: Promote a more active education and enforcement presence.

Strategies

- Initiate an education and enforcement strategy prior to development using methods such as gate management, a strategy for keeping users on trails, and enforcement patrols by motorcycles
- Pursue additional funding to increase education and enforcement staffing in Reiter Foothills Forest.

DRAFT — For Discussion Purposes Only — DRAFT 5/18/09 2

- Provide consistent signage that educates the public regarding allowed uses, existing regulations, campfire use, fire danger, and other applicable rules.
- Provide positive sign messaging that communicates information related to trail closures including why specific enforcement or management activities are taking place
- Provide the public with information regarding the best method to report a problem through management tools such as informational kiosks
- Coordinate emergency enforcement response with adjacent city and county jurisdictions
- Promote youth awareness by partnering with schools and involving students in maintenance and restoration
- Consider new methods to collect visitor information (such as zip codes) in order to better understand the needs of recreation users
- Provide public information regarding the potential for private property trespass.

Partnership and Volunteer Coordination

Partnerships with public agencies, user groups, and citizen volunteers are an important component of DNR's ongoing enforcement and maintenance programs.

Objective A: Pursue partnering opportunities for recreation projects with adjacent public agencies, adjacent landowners, and citizen volunteers.

Strategies

- Form partnerships with citizen volunteers who can maintain trails, act as camp hosts, and provide an overall increased presence on the landscape.
- Pursue additional opportunities to partner with enforcement personnel from adjacent municipalities, U.S. Forest Service, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Snohomish County, and Snohomish County Sheriff's Office.
- Increase educational opportunities by improving web-based resources that include maps of the area and recreation rules.
- Increase public awareness of the forest vision, trust mandate, and expected behaviors by encouraging volunteer participation for maintenance and planning, outreach to adjacent property owners, and user education.

DRAFT — For Discussion Purposes Only — DRAFT 5/18/09 3

Facility Management

DNR lands provide unique recreation opportunities for nearby residents and visitors from all over the state. As similar camping and day use opportunities on public lands become more scarce, Reiter Foothills plays an increasingly important recreation role.

Objective A: Develop opportunities for designated trailheads and campgrounds.

Strategies

- Assess feasibility of a campground designed for motorized use in a location adjoining the motorized trail system.
- Continue to acquire and consolidate DNR ownership in Reiter Foothills to provide benefit to the trust and increased recreation opportunities.

Objective B: Promote safety and sustainability through campground and day-use facility design and management.

Strategies

- Coordinate the timing of plan implementation with restoration efforts
- Develop a protection strategy for aquifer recharge protection areas
- Consider formation of a recreation plan implementation committee
- Utilize input from motorized and non-motorized user groups, professional trail designers and DNR staff when determining designated trail locations
- To the degree possible, locate facilities adjacent to major roads to make them readily accessible for maintenance and enforcement.
- Recruit campground hosts to provide a 24-hour presence in designated campgrounds during heavy use seasons.
- Ensure that future camping and day use facilities and renovations to existing facilities, are built to DNR standards and are consistent with existing policies, rules, and regulations.
- Ensure that existing and proposed facilities have the required leases, easements, or agreements to compensate the trust and meet grant funding requirements.
- Encourage separation of recreation uses through campground and facility design (i.e. facilities designed specifically for equestrian, motorized and non-motorized users, and day-use versus overnight use).

DRAFT — For Discussion Purposes Only — DRAFT 5/18/09 4

Objective C: Ensure that campground, facility and trail design and location are consistent with DNR's environmental stewardship responsibilities.

Strategies

- Determine appropriate locations for new recreation facilities and trails based on a land suitability process that considers habitat protection, soils and geological features, and forest management issues.
- Ensure that new facility and trail location and design are consistent with DNR's Habitat Conservation Plan and other relevant policies, procedures, and regulations.

Objective D: Evaluate the feasibility of fishing access on the Skykomish River

Trail Management Objectives and Strategies

Based on survey data and input from the citizen committee, additional trail opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized users are a priority.

Objective A: Promote additional opportunities for hiking, motorized and non-motorized trails, and trailhead construction that meet user needs and can be sustained over time.

Strategies

- Provide a range of trail lengths, loop, and destination trails that provide a range of trail experience.
- When establishing new designated trails, consider incorporating existing user built trails to the degree possible if they are consistent with DNR environmental and management requirements and located in appropriate areas.
- Pursue a management approach that encourages separate areas for motorized and non-motorized use through trail and trailhead design and location.
- Explore the idea of providing an interpretive trail to support public use opportunities such as school field trips.
- Consider a range of maintenance funding opportunities for trails and facilities including partnerships, commercial agreements, permits and fees
- Formulate a committee to provide on-going input regarding trail maintenance, field conditions and recreation user group considerations
- Collaborate with other agencies to pursue maintenance and enforcement funding
- Partner with volunteer groups to accomplish on-going maintenance and restoration activities

DRAFT — For Discussion Purposes Only — DRAFT 5/18/09 5

Objective B: Promote safety and sustainability through designated trail location, management, and design.

Strategies

- Design all trails to have bridges or culverts at stream crossings
- Consider a vehicle width limitation for motorized vehicles on trails
- Utilize seasonal trail closures to minimize potential environmental impact
- To the degree possible, locate trails away from exterior DNR property boundaries, unless trails are part of a planned linked system, to reduce potential for trespass and impacts on neighboring landowners.
- Pursue trail plans for areas identified as potential locations for motorized and non-motorized trail systems.
- Consider design principles for trails that include loop trails and destination trails with enough distance and variety to provide a quality user experience.
- Provide signage that promotes cooperative use of trails by different recreation use types.

Objective C: Promote safety and sustainability through designated trailhead and parking facility management and design.

Strategies

- Apply trailhead and parking area design criteria, as resources allow, that include the following:
 - Mechanisms to clearly delineate parking locations and define lot capacity.
 - Toilet facilities and other amenities.
 - Signs that communicate parking information, trail access information, and facility regulations.
 - Logs or other materials and methods to define the boundary of the facility.
 - Parking and trail access to accommodate the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- Consider the provision of motorized use areas for children and novice riders adjacent to motorized facilities to facilitate safe supervision.

DRAFT — For Discussion Purposes Only — DRAFT 5/18/09 6

Sustainable Funding

Identifying sustainable funding sources to meet DNR's facility and trail maintenance needs and to support capital improvements is essential to ensuring a quality user experience.

Objective A: Pursue sustainable funding opportunities that allow for the ongoing maintenance of facilities and trails.

Strategies

- Continue to apply for grant funding through the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) and to explore additional grant opportunities.
- Work to increase understanding regarding the costs associated with maintaining and operating trails and facilities.
- Pursue alternative funding sources for accomplishing plan objectives.

Development Implementation Priorities

Objective A: Pursue the following capital projects over the next 10-year time frame.

- **Priority 1:** Provide a motorized trailhead and trail system
- **Priority 2:** Provide a non-motorized trailhead and trail system
- **Priority 3:** Provide a campground designed for motorized use
- **Priority 4:** Evaluate feasibility of fishing access on the Skykomish River

Access and Easement Priorities

Objective A: Pursue the following access and easement recommendations.

- **Priority 1:** Pursue a connection between the southeast and central portion of the planning area
- **Priority 2:** Pursue adding to the planning area by acquiring adjacent parcels
- **Priority 3:** Pursue improved public access to the portion of the planning area west of Wallace Falls State Park

Reiter Foothills Recreation Planning

Draft Concept Plan(s) for Discussion Purposes Only 5-14-09

Draft Recreation Development Concepts Comparison Table	Concept D (revised)	Concept E (revised)
Non-Motorized Facilities	Non-Motorized Trailhead (Includes equestrian) & feasibility for Fishing Access/Parking	Feasibility for Fishing Access/Parking
Non-Motorized Areas* Acres to evaluate at a site-specific level for non-motorized trail development**	1090	830
Motorized Facilities	Motorized Trailhead & Motorized Campground	Motorized Trailhead & Motorized Campground
Motorized Areas* Acres to evaluate at a site-specific level for motorized trail development**	1040	1040

NOTE: The Non-Motorized category includes various combinations of hiking, mountain biking and equestrian trails as described on the accompanying map.

*All acreages are approximate and intended to represent general areas where site-specific trail development would be considered and evaluated. All acreages are rounded up to the nearest 10.

HOW TO's that are common to all concepts (these need to be further developed, discussed and will lead to planning objectives and strategies)
These are listed with numbers for ease of discussion -numbers are not intended to represent prioritization

Development

1. Coordinate the timing of plan implementation with restoration efforts
2. Develop a protection strategy for aquifer recharge area
3. Utilize input from motorized and non-motorized user groups, professional trail designers and DNR staff when determining the designated trail locations (form an implementation committee)
4. Provide looped trail systems wherever possible
5. Consider providing interpretive trails
6. Design trails that provide a technical and challenging user experiences
7. Design all trails to have bridged crossings at streams
8. Establish a size limitation for motorized vehicles on trails (i.e. wheel size?)
9. Design trailheads to include sanitation facilities

other...

Preliminary Draft 5-2009 For Discussion Purposes Only –
Subject to Change Without Notification

